```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                      EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 17-CR-434 (ARR)
 4
                Plaintiff.
 5
             -against-
 6
     JOSÉ MIGUEL MELENDEZ-ROJAS,
     also known as "Gueramex,"
     "Gueracasa," and "Joșé
 7
     Melendez Perez"; JOSÉ
                                     : United States Courthouse
     OSVALDO MELENDEZ-ROJAS,
 8
                                    : Brooklyn, New York
     ROSALIO MELENDEZ-ROJAS, also
     known as "Leonel," "Wacho," and "El Guacho"; FRANCISCO
9
     MELENDEZ-PEREZ, also known as "Paco," and "el Mojarra";
10
11
     and ABEL ROMERO-MELENDEZ,
     also known as "La Borrega"
12
     and "Borrego"
                                      : Monday, March 2, 2020
13
               Defendants.
                                     : 2:00 p.m.
14
15
             TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR JURY TRIAL
            BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALLYNE R. ROSS AND A JURY
16
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT SENIOR JUDGE
17
18
19
                         APPEARANCES:
    For the Government:
20
                               RICHARD P. DONOGHUE, ESQ.
                               United States Attorney
                               Eastern District of New York
21
                               271 Cadman Plaza East
                               Brooklyn, New York 11201
22
                               BY: ERIN ARGO, ESQ.
                                    TANYA H. HAJJAR, ESQ.
23
                                    GILLIAN KASSNER, ESQ.
                                    Assistant United States Attorneys
24
25
```

	2
1	APPEARAN CES (CONTINUED)
2	For the Defendant CUCAN CONFILMAN FOO
3	For the Defendant SUSAN G. KELLMAN, ESQ. José Miguel 25 Eighth Avenue Malandar Baica: Bracklyn New York 11217
4	Melendez-Rojas: Brooklyn, New York 11217
5	For the Defendant M. GOLUB PLLC José Osvaldo 225 Broadway Melendez-Rojas: Suite 1515 New York, New York 10007 BY: MITCHELL A. GOLUB, ESQ.
6	
7	
8	For the Defendant THOMAS E V DINN ESO
9	For the Defendant THOMAS F.X. DUNN, ESQ. Rosalio 225 Broadway Melendez-Rojas: Suite 1515
10	Melendez-Rojas: Suite 1515 New York, New York 10007
11	For the Defendant MICHAEL H. GOLD, ESQ.
12	Francisco 350 Fifth Avenue
13	Melendez-Perez: Suite 6800 New York, New York 10118
14	For the Defendant MICHAEL HUESTON, ESQ.
15	Abel 16 Court Street Romero-Melendez: Suite 1800
16	Brooklyn, New York 11241
17	AND
18	LAW OFFICES OF JACQUELINE E. CISTARO 11 Broadway
19	Suite 615 New York, New York 10004
20	BY: JACQUELINE E. CISTARO, ESQ.
21	Court Reporter: DAVID R. ROY, RPR 225 Cadman Plaza East
22	Brooklyn, New York 11201 (718) 613-2609
23	drroyofcr@gmail.com
24	Proceedings recorded by Stangaraphia machine shorthand
25	Proceedings recorded by Stenographic machine shorthand, transcript produced by Computer-Assisted Transcription.

```
3
                               Proceedings
                                           N G S
                       ROCEEDI
1
 2
 3
                               --00000--
 4
5
              (In open court; jury not present.)
              THE COURT: If any of the defense counsel need a
6
7
    mic.
8
              THE INTERPRETER: Your Honor, if I may, for the
9
    interpreters it's impossible for us to hear the entire words
10
    that are being projected that way and not that way, and we're
11
    speaking at the same time so everybody has to use a
12
    microphone.
13
              THE COURT: So everybody has to use a microphone,
14
    that's great.
15
              I'm assuming nobody is using the ELMO during the
16
    openings; is that correct?
17
              MR. HUESTON: That's correct, Your Honor.
18
              MR. GOLUB: I'm not.
19
              MS. KELLMAN: That's correct, Judge.
20
              MS. ARGO: That's correct, Judge.
21
              THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
22
              (Jury enters courtroom.)
23
              THE COURT: Please be seated. Dennis, if you could
24
    swear the jury.
25
               (Jury sworn.)
```

1 (THE JURY: I do.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please be seated.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we're about to begin the trial of this criminal case about which you've heard something during the course of jury selection.

But before the trial begins, there are certain things that I wish to tell you to help you understand what will be presented and how you should conduct yourselves during the trial.

To begin with, you are here to administer justice in this case according to the law and the evidence. You are to perform this task with complete fairness and impartiality and without bias, prejudice or sympathy for or against the government or the defendants. This case is important to the defendants who are charged with committing crimes and who have the constitutional right to receive a fair trial. The case is also important to the government since the enforcement of the criminal laws is important.

The case is based on an indictment. During jury selection I read the indictment to you. I instructed you then that the indictment is simply the document by which a criminal action is commenced. It is merely an accusation, it is not evidence of a defendant's guilt.

Because the defendants have pleaded not guilty, the government has the burden of proving each of the essential elements of the crime charged in the indictment beyond a

reasonable doubt. The purpose of the trial is to determine whether the government meets this burden. The defendants are not required to prove their innocence. On the contrary, the defendant is presumed to be innocent of the accusations contained in the indictment.

As you've already heard, the indictment contains 15 counts. I will define each of these crimes and their elements for you in my instructions after the presentation of evidence. In most general terms, Count One charges all of the defendants with conspiring, that is, agree to smuggle aliens.

Count Two charges all defendants with conspiring to transport minors to engage in prostitution.

Count Three alleges all of the defendants -- charges all the defendants with conspiring to engage in sex trafficking.

Count Four charges three defendants, José Miguel
Melendez-Rojas, Rosalio Melendez-Rojas and Abel
Romero-Melendez with the sex trafficking of a minor, Jane Doe
number one, that is Diana.

Count Five charges three defendants, José Miguel Melendez-Rojas, José Osvaldo Melendez-Rojas and Rosalio Melendez-Rojas with the sex trafficking of Jane Doe number two, that is Veronica.

Count Six charges two defendants, José Osvaldo Melendez-Rojas and Rosalio Melendez-Rojas with the sex

trafficking of Jane Doe number three, that is Fabiola.

Count Seven charges the same two defendants with alien smuggling of Jane Doe number three, who is Fabiola.

Count Eight charges two defendants, José Osvaldo Melendez-Rojas and Francisco Melendez-Perez with the sex trafficking of Jane Doe number four, that is Maria.

Count Nine charges the same two defendants with alien smuggling of Jane Doe number four, that is Maria.

Count Ten charges four defendants, José
Melendez-Rojas, José Osvaldo Melendez-Rojas, Rosalio
Melendez-Rojas, and Francisco Melendez-Perez with the sex
trafficking of Jane Doe number five, that is Delia.

Count Eleven charges the same four defendants with the transportation of a minor Jane Doe number five, that is Delia to engage in prostitution.

Count Twelve charges the same four defendants with alien smuggling of Jane Doe number five, who is Delia.

Count Fifteen charges the same four defendants with conspiring to launder money.

Count Sixteen charges the same four defendants with distributing the proceeds of a prostitution business, and Count Eighteen charges defendant Abel Romero-Melendez with illegal reentry into the United States.

The trial will proceed in the following order:
First, the parties have the opportunity to make

Proceedings

opening statements. The government will make such a statement, then the defendants may do so. The defendants are not, however, obligated to make an opening. Indeed, the defendants have no obligation to do anything in the course of the trial. What is said in these opening statements is not evidence, rather the attorneys will attempt to give you an introduction to or an overview the evidence which they expect will be produced in the course of the trial.

After the opening statements, the government will introduce evidence in support of the charge contained in the indictment. This may be testimony from witnesses, it may be physical items, documents and exhibits which are offered in evidence. If an item is received in evidence, the attorneys may choose to have you look at it here in open court right at the moment that it is received. Whether they do this or not however, if you wish to study any exhibits further, and to the extent practical, I will send any requested exhibits received in evidence into the jury room during your deliberations so you will have ample opportunity to examine them.

You should pay careful attention to the testimony given by the witnesses. Let me say, however, that if in the course of your deliberations you have any questions as to what a witness in fact said on any matter, the court reporter is available to go his or her notes and read back to you the portions on which you have a question, or we will make copies

of the relevant transcript available to you in the jury room.

Second, when the government has concluded putting on its evidence the defendant may put on evidence but they are not required to do so. The burden is always on the government to prove every element of an offense charged beyond a reasonable doubt. The law never imposes on a defendant in a criminal case the burden of any calling any witnesses or introducing any evidence.

Third, if a defendant puts on any evidence, the government may or may not wish to put further evidence before you to rebut what the defense has set forth.

Once all evidence has been presented, each party has the opportunity to present closing arguments or summations to you. What is said in these arguments is not evidence. Each party is simply presenting to you its view of what the evidence has shown and suggesting to you the inferences or conclusions you should draw from the evidence. You may find an argument sound and persuasive or you may not. Because the government has the burden of proof in the case it has the right to argue first, followed the defendants after which the government may give a rebuttal summation.

Fifth, after you've heard the arguments, I will instruct you on the applicable law. You will then retire to consider your verdict. Your verdict must be unanimous. You have a tremendously important task as jurors. It is to

Proceedings

determine the facts. Our Constitution gives the defendant a right to have you, who are members of the community, find those facts. You and not the Court are the sole judges of the facts. I shall try to preside impartially and not to express any opinion concerning the facts. If, at any time, I should make any comment with respect to the facts, you may disregard it. It is your judgment as to the facts not mine which controls. As sole judges of the facts you must determine which of the witnesses you believe, what portion of their testimony you accept and what weight you attach to it.

In the course of the trial the attorneys may from time to time stand and say that they object to a certain question or to certain evidence. There are certain rules that apply to the receipt of evidence in trials. If I sustain an objection, it means that I think the law does not prevent receipt of the evidence in question. You are to disregard the question asked. You are not to speculate about how it might have been answered, you simply have no evidence before you on that subject. If I sustain an objection after the answer has been given, I will strike the answer. Meaning that you are not to consider it at all in your deliberations. You are to act as if that answer had never been given.

On the other hand, if I overrule an objection, it means that I find no legal reason not to allow the evidence to come before you. You should not, however, attach any special

Proceedings

significance to evidence that comes in over an objection, simply consider it together with all the other evidence in the case.

No statement, ruling, remark or comment which I may make during the course of the trial is intended to indicate any opinion as to how you should decide the case or to influence you in any way in your determination of the facts. At times I may ask questions of witnesses, I do so simply to bring out matters which I think should be brought out and not in any way that indicate an opinion about the facts or the weight you should give the testimony of the particular witness.

You must not be influenced by anything you may have seen or heard outside this courtroom. This case must be decided by jurors who base their decision solely on the witness's testimony and the other evidence introduced at trial. This means from today until the end of the trial you must not conduct any independent research about this case, the matters in this case or the individuals involved in this case.

In other words, you should not consult dictionaries or reference materials, search the Internet, look to websites or blogs or use any other electronic tools to obtain information about this case or help you in your decision as jurors. It is very important that your decision be made solely on the basis of the evidence presented in this case and

that you not seek information from any source outside the confines of this courtroom.

There are several rules which should govern your conduct during any recess or break that we take in the trial. First, do not discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else during any recess. Even as among yourselves you see, it is important that each of you keep an open mind reaching a conclusion only during your final deliberations after all of the evidence is in and you've heard the attorneys' summations and my instructions on the law. Only then will you begin to exchange views among yourselves and reach your verdict.

Now the instruction that I've just given is counterintuitive, it is contrary to human nature. Serving on a jury is a unique experience. It's an interesting experience. It's an experience that you'll perhaps have only once or twice in your lifetime and it is something that you would naturally want to share with friends or family as the trial goes along. What's wrong with that is that as you begin discussing the case with others, they begin giving you their opinion about what they think about the case, even though they haven't been here, even though they haven't heard any of the evidence, even though they haven't heard the arguments of counsel or my instructions on the law and it fundamentally deprives all of the parties of a verdict that's based on the determination of jurors who have heard all of what I've just

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

referred to. So as difficult as it may be, please do not discuss the case with anyone else. And when I say do not discuss the case, I'm talking about the evidence in the case in particular and any view that you might have about the evidence. Please do not discuss the case at all.

The same is true with respect to discussing the case among yourselves. That, too, is counterintuitive and contrary to human nature. After all, the thing that brings you all together here is this trial. What's wrong with beginning your discussion in the case before the case is submitted to you is, if you begin talking about the case even among yourselves you begin to come to tentative opinions and conclusions that might close your mind to other evidence, arguments by counsel, or to my instructions on the law. Here again, when I say do not talk about the case, what I'm telling you is a common sense rule. You can talk about how you think the lawyers look, whether you like what they're wearing or not, innocuous conversation is perfectly all right. When I say don't talk about the case even among yourselves, I'm talking about the evidence that you hear in the courtroom and whether the defendants are guilty or not guilty. Also you should not permit any other person to discuss this case with you or in your presence. And if anyone should approach you in an effort to discuss the case with you, you should report that back to me and you should tell that person that you cannot discuss the

Proceedings

case. You should not, however, discuss with your fellow jurors either that fact or any other fact that you may feel necessary to bring to my attention. The reason is obvious, if something occurs that affects the ability of a juror to continue to serve fair and impartially and that juror communicates it to fellow jurors, then more than one of you may be affected.

Third, although it's normal for people to talk with those with whom we are thrown in day-to-day contact, please do not, while you're serving as jurors in this case, have any conversation with the parties, the attorneys, or any witnesses in the case whether in the courtroom, in the hallways, in the elevator, outside or anywhere else. By this I mean not only do not talk about the case, do not talk at all even to pass the time of day. You see, someone seeing a juror in conversation with a party, lawyer or witness might think that something improper was being discussed. To avoid even the appearance of impropriety then, have no conversations. The lawyers as officers of the court are particularly sensitive to this. So I can tell you that if they pass you in the halls without even acknowledging your presence, they do not mean to be rude.

Those of you who have been selected as alternate jurors should listen just as carefully and conscientiously as the other jurors. You may very well be called upon prior to

Proceedings

the conclusion of the case to take the place of one of the jurors and then you will have to render a verdict. So please, pay strict attention at all times.

And with that by way of introduction, we will now hear from the prosecutor. Ms. Kassner.

MS. KASSNER: Thank you, Your Honor.

In May 2010, in a small town in Mexico, a 14-year old girl named Delia thought she was in love. She decided to leave her parents' home and move in with her boyfriend, Francisco. She thought she was leaving for a better life. What Delia didn't know is that Francisco and his relatives had other plans for her. What Delia didn't know is that the defendants, Francisco Melendez-Perez, his cousin Abel Romero-Melendez and his uncles José Miguel Melendez-Rojas, José Osvaldo Melendez-Rojas, and Rosalio Melendez-Rojas together made their living by smuggling young women and girls like Delia to the United States where they forced them to work in prostitution. Sex trafficking was their family business.

Delia didn't know any of these things so she went with Francisco to his family home in Mexico and when Francisco asked her to go with him to the United States she agreed.

Together, Delia and Francisco made their way from Mexico to Arizona and from Arizona to Queens in New York City. There they moved into an apartment with Francisco's uncle, the defendant Rosalio Melendez-Rojas. After they arrived in New

Proceedings

York City, Francisco ordered Delia for the first time to work as a prostitute. Delia refused but Francisco and Rosalio forced her, they told her that she didn't speak English, that she had no papers and that she owed thousands of dollars in smuggling fees for being brought to the United States. They told her that if she tried to ask the police for help they wouldn't believe her and they would arrest her and deport her. You will learn that Delia was completely alone with no money, nobody to turn to in the United States and nowhere to go.

On her first night, Francisco forced Delia to have sex with 15 to 20 men. She was only a 14-year old girl. And after that night things only got worse. Whenever Delia refused to work, Francisco threatened her and then beat her. He threatened her again, he beat her again, he punched her in the face, he dragged her on the floor and whenever he thought she was pregnant, he would try to force her to have a miscarriage. For four years Delia was forced to live this life until she finally found the courage to escape.

During this trial you will learn that Delia was not the only victim the defendants trafficked in this way. In addition to Delia you will hear testimony from five other victims, five other women who were forced into prostitution by the defendants and their relatives. You'll hear from Maria, you'll hear from Veronica, you'll hear from Fabiola, you'll hear from Diana, you'll hear from Daisy.

This case is about what the defendants did to all of these women and girls and others who you will hear about during the course of the trial. It is about the tactics the defendants used over the course of a decade to deceive them, to manipulate them and to sexually exploit them for profit.

You will learn that each defendant's role varied depending on the victim. For each victim there was one main trafficker who recruited her and maintained primary control over her. But the defendants all worked together to ensure that both the victims they recruited and those their family members recruited all stayed in line with their demands. Their roles varied but the goal was the same, to make money.

To recruit their victims the defendants approached young women and girls often in small towns in Mexico and tried to seduce them. They gave them gifts and met their families. They made promises, promises of love or of marriage or of a better life in the United States. Then they lured their victims to their family compounds where they made arrangements to bring them to the United States. They paid smugglers to transport them on buses or guide them as they walked days through the desert to get here. But after the women and girls arrived in the United States a new reality set in. The defendants told their victims that they had no choice but to have sex with strangers for money. Money the defendants kept.

In forcing their victims into prostitution, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

defendants employed a delivery service model, where drivers took the women and girls to clients all night long. Each session lasted about 15 minutes and it cost about \$30. During a six- to seven-hour shift, a girl would typically see between 15 and 20 men. At the end of the shift, half the money went to the driver and the other half to her trafficker. Every day the defendants' victims were driven by these delivery drivers from client to client to client in Delaware, in Connecticut, in New Jersey, on Long Island and right here in New York City. Every night before each shift, the defendants would carefully count out and hand their victims a set of condoms and every night after each shift they would carefully count the ones that remained to make sure their victims had turned over every cent of their earnings to them, then the defendants took that money and wired it back to Mexico to their own family members and associates.

The evidence will show that the defendants used threats and force to keep their victims working seven days a week without a break even if they were sick, or bleeding, or injured. And you will learn that their victims were often injured. For years the defendants abused them. They threatened to hurt or to kill their mothers, their sisters, their brothers, their daughters. They punched them in the face and in the ribs, they kicked them and they raped them.

This is the life that the defendants forced these

women and girls to endure. Day after day, shift after shift, some of them for months and many of them for years.

For smuggling young women and girls from Mexico into the United States, the defendants are charged with alien smuggling and immigration offenses. For forcing young women and girls to have six against their will for money, the defendants are charged with sex trafficking, sex trafficking conspiracy, sex trafficking of minors and prostitution offenses. And for taking the money that their victims were given and sending it to their own family members and criminal associates, the defendants are charged with the illegal distribution of proceeds of a prostitution business and money laundering offenses.

We will prove these charges to you beyond a reasonable doubt with several types of evidence.

First, the victims. As I mentioned, during the trial you will hear from the victims themselves. They will tell you about all the ways the defendants physically and psychologically forced and coerced them into prostitution, claims of love, promises for a better life, followed by threats, violence, slaps, punches, verbal abuse, rape and as to several victims, forced abortions.

Second, you'll see physical evidence that was recovered from the defendants' and victims' apartments. Some of these items will include tolls of the prostitution trade,

Opening Statement - Ms. Kellman

condoms, cell phones, notebooks with lists of phone numbers in them, and dozens and dozens of cars used by delivery drivers to attract clients, which you'll hear referred to as "chica" cars during the trial.

And finally, you'll see documents that will provide an inside look into the defendants' prostitution business. These will include phone records, wire transfer records and border crossing records that show women coming into the country and money going out back to the defendants in Mexico. This is just a summary of some of the evidence that we'll present during the course of the trial.

As you see and hear the evidence you will be exposed to some of the details of forced sex trafficking right here in New York City by women who lived through it. Then at the end of the trial after you've seen and heard all the evidence, we will come back to you and we will ask you to return the only verdict consistent with that evidence, and that is a verdict of guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Kellman.

MS. KELLMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Everybody who knows me knows I don't need a microphone and that I will probably trip somewhere along the way, but I'll do my best.

Members of the jury, criminal prosecution of a fellow human being presents a lawyer and a jury, each of you individually and collectively, with a unique challenge.

Georgette Betts, RPA, CSA - Official Court Reporter

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Opening Statement - Ms. Kellman

You've heard the government's opening. You've heard words like smuggling, alien smuggling, trafficking, prostitution, extortion, and violence. And consciously or unconsciously that narrative will challenge you. And here's the challenge. Can you be true to the oath that you just swore in this very court. The oath to fairly and impartially listen and weigh the evidence, weigh it impartially and come up ultimately with a lawful verdict. When each of you took that oath, you promised the defendants and the Court that you would fairly try this case, that you would listen and that you would keep an open mind and that you would remember that the each of the defendants in this case is presumed to be innocent. As they sit here today, my client, José Miguel Melendez-Rojas, is presumed to be innocent. If the trial ended right now and you were asked to render a verdict, you would have to say not guilty. And that's true at the end of -- the beginning and the end of every trial day until such time as the jury is -the trial ends and the jury goes in to deliberate and that is the first time that you'll actually have an opportunity to have a discussion about what, if anything, the evidence proves.

Now, Judge Ross told you in her opening remarks, and it is very important, that each of the defendants is presumed innocent and has no obligation to testify, has no obligation to say anything at all because the burden of proof rests

Opening Statement - Ms. Kellman

solely and exclusively and always at that table. And if the government can't prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt, then your oath requires you to render a verdict -- to return a verdict of not guilty.

Now notwithstanding that the defendants don't have to say anything, my client, Mr. Melendez-Rojas José Miguel, has spoken in this very court when he was notified of the charges, the ones that were read to you by the Judge, he stood in this very court and said, Your Honor, I am not guilty. Not guilty.

Now, I want to share a little personal story with and you maybe first I'll tell you who I am. Hi. My name is Susan Kellman and I represent one of the defendants in this case and that is José Miguel Melendez-Rojas. Now you may think this has nothing to do with where we're headed, but I promise you it does.

About a month ago I had a flood in my house and it was a mess. And the insurance company arranged for me to move into another house and so I went to look at the house and I'm looking around, is this where I want to spend the next few months. It's very uncomfortable and weird, and the people who live there weren't there. And as I walked through the house to see if I was comfortable, one of the things I saw was lots of family pictures around. I saw repeatedly a picture of an older couple with their arms around each other and then I saw

Georgette Betts, RPA, CSA - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Ms. Kellman

other pictures with 20 somethings and 30 something-year old kids, also all in photographs and then five, six, three, four-years olds. So in my mind the evidence that I saw said that this was an older couple who owned this home and they had children along the way, and their children had children along the way and they were very proud of the family that they had built because the pictures were everywhere.

The next thing I noticed as I walked through the house was at the top of one of the staircases there was a legal-looking document, although it was awfully pretty, but legal looking. What it was was something called a Ketubah. And a Ketubah is something I knew about, it's a Jewish marriage contract and I recognized the word in Hebrew, everything else was in Hebrew and it didn't really matter, I knew what it was, but it said Ketubah.

Now, I have a picture of this elderly couple and all of their children and their children's children and the Ketubah, so this tells me that they are a married couple, that they're Jewish and that they have lots of kids and grandkids.

(Continued on the next page.)

Opening Statement - Ms. Kellman

(In open court.)

MS. KELLMAN (CONTINUING): So I have seen more facts and reached more conclusions.

I then go into the kitchen to look around, to see if it's going to be agreeable to me, if I'm going to be comfortable; and I see something that I don't see in every house, and it's two sinks. One sink on one island, and one sink on another island. And this says to me, why do people have two sinks in the same kitchen? Well, if they were an observant Jewish family, Jewish families oftentimes, observant Jewish families, have two sinks because the Torah tells them, the bible tells them, that you can't mix milk and meet. So you have one sink where you wash things, dishes that have meat involved in them, and another one that has dairy involved in them.

You are all dying to know where this is going. I can see that.

Finally, I say to the real estate agent, who has now joined me, why are these people not here for so many months? Why are they leaving their beautiful home? And they said, well, every winter they go down to Palm Beach and they vacation. Snowbirds is the word, the phrase, I was raised with. What is a snow bird? It's the old Jewish couples who go down to Florida, hang around with other old Jewish couples until it gets warm in New York, and then they come back up.

Michele Nardone, CSK, CRK - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Ms. Kellman

Why am I telling you this? Because every fact I saw led to another conclusion, and every conclusion I reached turned out to be wrong. Every one. Even though as I heard it I confronted it, and I knew it to be not just reasonable but the only conclusion I thought I could reach.

So the real estate agent, after I told him I liked the apartment, says you should go back there and try to bring as much stuff as you can before the couple leaves and get to meet them. So I ring the doorbell, and I got my dogs, my kids in the car, and everybody is carrying something. And I ring the doorbell and an African-American man opens the door, and I said, oh, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to disturb you. Is Nathaniel around? Because I was told the man's name was Nathaniel. He said, oh, I'm Nathaniel. Okay.

This did not look like an old Jewish man because this was a 20-something African-American man. So I'm thinking, why is this Nathaniel. What am I missing? And then ten seconds later Dominick comes over, introduces himself, and puts his arm around Nathaniel; and Nathaniel, a middle-aged Jewish guy -- and Nathaniel and Dominick are married. And had I taken the time to look at the Ketubah more carefully, I would have seen both of their names on the Ketubah.

I'm thinking it's this African-American man and this Italian man, whose parents are Jewish, one of his parents are Jewish. What's with the two sinks? So now I really just have

Michele Nardone, CSR, CRR - Officia, Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Ms. Kellman

to ask because also I don't want to violate. If they do keep a kosher home, I don't want to violate the rules. Do I need to keep two sinks? Do you divide by meat and dairy? Oh, no. Don't be ridiculous. Nathaniel, he is a nut. We have two dogs. He doesn't like when I wash the dogs' dishes in the sink where we have our food. So he requires me to use two separate sinks, one for the dogs and one for our food.

So now I have got pretty much everything wrong, but, still, why is this young gay couple going to Palm Beach to vacation with all old Jewish people. So I sort of have to ask, and they say, Palm Beach? Why would we go down to Palm Beach with all the old people. We go to Palm Springs.

Every fact I heard and every conclusion I reached was wrong. And I tell you this because the most important thing that you will do here as jurors is keep an open mind.

When you hear a fact, file it away, but don't close your mind to it. You know, I know that every one of you, when you got the jury notice, you said, yes, I hit the jackpot. I'm so lucky today. To you especially. I know I'm going to be a juror. Isn't that just fantastic? And this morning, when you were on your way here -- whether it was by bus or by train -- you may read the newspaper or read some news online, and you were allowed to believe it. You didn't have to believe it, but you were allowed to believe it.

But that all changed when you took the oath just a

Opening Statement - Ms. Kellman

little while ago, because once you take the oath you can no longer believe everything you hear, like I do. You have to critically -- you have to listen with a critical ear. You have to decide whether or not you are getting a true story, whether or not you are getting the whole story. And you can't do that until you have heard it all.

I will make you one promise, and that is that when this trial is over you will feel the better for having served as jurors because it is as important a role as we get as citizens of this great country. You will see that when you enter the room, we all rise, and we rise for three reasons.

One, we rise to show our respect for the office of juror, because that's who you are now. You are officials. You are jurors.

We also rise to remind you that you are the sole judges of the facts. Judge Ross is the sole judge of the law. She will tell you what the law is. But it's your job to figure out what the facts are; and because you hear something on Monday, it may not be the same on Tuesday because other pieces of the puzzle get filled in; and whenever you are not sure about that, I want you to think about Palm Beach and think about the dog's sinks, but the reality is the conclusions I reached I would have sworn to. They were 100 percent. But they were 100 percent wrong. So I beg you, keep an open mind.

Michele Nardone, CSK, CRK - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Golub

The third reason -- I did tell you there were three reasons we rise -- and the third is to remind each of you of the importance of your office and to show our respect for each of you as jurors.

My client and the other defendants in this case are presumed to be innocent, and, at the end of the day, at the end of the case, members of the jury, it is my fervent hope that when you weigh all of the evidence that you come to the only fair and just conclusion, and that is that José Miguel Melendez-Rojas is not guilty.

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Golub.

MR GOLUB: Something I have never needed was a microphone. Oh, boy. It's after 5:00. You are looking tired, exhausted. I can't possibly match what you just heard.

My name is Mitchell Golub. Good afternoon. I represent José Osvaldo Melendez-Rojas. He has the blue shirt on.

As Ms. Kellman told you, you have taken an oath. You said you would keep an open mind. You are going to listen to the evidence in this case and you are going to follow the judge's instructions, and the first one she told you was that my client -- all the defendants that are here -- are presumed innocent.

Michelε Nardonε, CSR, CRR - Officiaι Courτ Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Golub

They have made the only statement they ever have to make in the case by pleading not guilty. They are accused by an indictment. They pled not guilty. There is nothing further they have to do in the case.

Now, the government has presented to you a version of the facts, as they think they are going to prove them; and what I had planned to do as the defense attorney in this case is to question and challenge the witnesses that you are going to hear. As Ms. Kellman already told you, you can't take anything that you hear at face value because as jurors that have taken the oath, you have to be critical and listen to everything that you hear.

What you have been told here was in the accusations that women had come that are victims of sex trafficking, money laundering, a whole slew of other charges that are all related to that. What do you need to know about all of this? What you need to know is that each of these women who is going to come in here and testify for you, and they are going to take an oath and they are going to swear to tell the truth, but you have to decide if they are actually telling the truth. Because one of the things that you have to consider when you hear what they say is, what are they getting out of their testimony? Why are they doing this? What is the purpose of that?

What you are going to find out in the case of each

Opening Statement - Mr. Golub

of the women is that each of them face charges of prostitution, they face charges of illegal entry into the country. They face all these other charges they could face jail time for, and then eventually deportation afterwards. What you are going to find out is that each of these women -- in exchange for saying that not that they voluntarily were prostitutes and not that they voluntarily came to this country to do this because they wanted to make a living because they were impoverished in Mexico -- what they did here, they did this because of the fact that the government says to them, oh, if you are -- if you are a victim of sex trafficking, no verdicts. We are not going to prosecute you.

In fact, we are going to give you a visa and we are going to help you get a green card so you can stay here permanently. You are not going to face any charges and you are going to get your dream. You wanted to come here to America to stay? You are going to get here to stay. You were here illegally, you are subject to deportation? Not anymore. You are facing criminal charges? Not anymore. All of that changes by virtue of the fact that you have taken the witness stand now and you are saying whatever actually happened, I was a victim of sex trafficking.

So the credibility of the women who come in here is an issue in the case. It's a central issue in the case. So what I want you to do when you are listening to the women --

Opening Statement - Mr. Golub

and particularly listening to cross-examination -- is say is there a motive for them testifying the way they did. Because none of us are going to dispute that the women were prostitutes. The question is: Were they doing this of their own volition, of their own free will; and only now, because they are otherwise facing prosecution for it, criminal charges, deportation, everything else, having now turned around and said, well, I was forced to do it, I was a victim. That's the key issue in this case.

My client is here because, as I said, he pled not guilty. He says, I haven't forced anybody to do anything. People who have come here, came here of their own free will. Nobody twisted their arm. Nobody hijacked them. Nobody snuck them in against their will. They all came here willingly. They all engaged in prostitution willingly, but they are now changing the scenario because the government is now going to give them a green card. The government is going to give them benefits. They are going to do all these other things for them in exchange for their testimony. You have to consider that in evaluating the situation in this case.

So again, it's late. The hour is late. I'm not going to belabor any more. I'm going to ask you to keep an open mind, and, I hope, if you do that and you follow the oath as jurors, at the end of the case you are going to find that the people have not met their burden of proof and not proven

Opening Statement - Mr. Dunn

the charge against my client; and I'm going to ask you to come back with a verdict of not guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Dunn.

MR. DUNN: I'm ready. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Good afternoon to the government team and to the defense. Mr. Melendez-Rojas, my client, is the gentleman in the blue sweater with the white stripes.

I know I can't be more eloquent than Ms. Kellman was, and she basically put in a nutshell basically what I was going to say, not as elaborate and things like that. So what you are going to hear is you are going to hear a lawyer probably talk less than a minute.

And this is basically what I want to say. The government talks about evidence, evidence, evidence. The question is: Is it a fact? Is it true? You can drive a truck in here with a lot of different things, but is it evidence. If it is evidence, is it a fact? Is it true? Is it credible?

So you are going to have to look at these witnesses, and they are going to testify. As they testify, that is evidence. Is it true? Is it a fact? And as you see them on direct examination, how they answer the prosecution -- the prosecutors, and as you see them on cross, if lawyers ask them on cross-examination -- because we don't have to do anything; I can go back over there and just go to sleep if I want to --

Michele Nardone, CSR, CRR - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold 32 1 but just remember that, people say it's evidence but is it a 2 fact? Is it true? 3 At the end of this case, I'm going to come back, and 4 I will point out to you why I don't think certain things are true or factual. I'm going to ask you to return a verdict of 5 not guilty. 6 7 Thanks very much. A little over a minute. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Gold. 9 MR. GOLD: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is 10 Michael Gold. I represent Francisco Melendez-Perez, who is seated next to me at the table. 11 12 We spent a lot of time this morning -- Judge Ross, I 13 should say, spent a lot of time this morning talking to you 14 about the charges in this case and how dramatic, inflammatory, sensitive, offensive that they are. To try and steel your 15 16 resolve and determine whether or not each and every one of you 17 were appropriate and ready to serve on a case of such a 18 nature. 19 Frankly, it was impossible this morning, as you 20 heard a sterile recitation of what was to come before you, I 21 think, for you to truly get the picture of what your task will 22 be over the next several weeks. 23 You just heard from my friend, Ms. Kassner. She has 24 described to you -- in excruciating, horrific detail --

stories that you will hear from the witness stand; and,

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold

frankly, while you each took an oath, you are determined to satisfy that oath, we, all of us in this courtroom, are relying on your ability to follow that oath, I'm scared to death.

I'm scared to death that the very nature of this case, the very charges in this case will make that impossible for you. That upon hearing stories of 14-year-olds being forced into prostitution, your blood starts burning, your stomach starts turning, and your mind turns off, that that's it. Why? Because it's revolting. I don't blame you. I get it.

But that's your job. You signed up for individual justice, not mob vengeance; and we are counting on you. I'm counting on you. My client is counting on you.

Now, as you see, there are five defendants here, each represented by separate counsel. You have heard they are related in various ways. But while they may be related and the charges somewhat overlap, in all important respects, in essence, these are five separate charges. That's why they each have five separate counsel.

While we will try, because we are not a team, we will try not to repeat the same things, I'm going to stand here now and try not to repeat the same things my colleagues have already told you and discussed with you, but, frankly, it's inevitable. There will be questions that are

Michele Nardone, CSR, CRR - Officiaι Courι Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold

repetitious. There will be themes that are discussed that are duplicative. It's unavoidable, and I apologize to you in advance, but it's going to happen.

Now, I believe Judge Ross has already indicated that nothing I'm telling you is evidence. Nothing that my friend Ms. Kassner has told you is evidence. And there is good reason for that. If Ms. Kassner was a witness, she would be called to the witness stand, she'd take an oath similar to the oath that you took, and then she would tell you, raise her hand and tell you all the things that she told you during her opening statement, all of those horrific, despicable, revolting things. Frankly, you would probably believe her. She's got a good job. She has no ax to grind. She is not here with an agenda. She won't benefit or suffer from the outcome of this case in any regard.

She is here, as you would expect anybody to take a witness stand in the courts of the United States of America, raise their right hand, swear to tell the truth, and do exactly that, tell the truth. She's a hard witness to challenge and, frankly, you would believe her. But here is the catch. She is not a witness. She didn't see any of the things she told you occurred. She didn't hear any of the things that these witnesses who will be coming before you will claim to have had happen to them.

The evidence in this case will come from human

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold

beings. Human beings with maybe horrific stories of a personal history, but human beings who you must scrutinize and challenge in your mind, as we will with our questions, to ensure the truth surfaces. Because, as in my example, Ms. Kassner had no ax to grind, no benefit, no agenda, that's not the case with the witnesses who are going to come here before you. Because from the very start of this investigation, you will hear that they had a very real and life-altering stake in the outcome of this -- of first the investigation and now very well on the outcome of your verdict.

It is that self-interest that we will come to you -I will come to you at the end and highlight as one of many
reasons why Delia should not be believed. As you heard, she
is the primary witness against my client, against Francisco.
And there, she has led a life that no one should lead. She
has suffered in a way that no one should suffer.

She was 14 when she met Francisco, as Ms. Kassner told you. Before that -- that's not even remotely when the worst part of her life occurred. Because she will tell you that at the age of nine and ten she was raped by her father and her uncle, repeatedly. And her mother didn't believe her. And so she ran away. She left them.

Imagine that? Nine, ten years old. Your heart will go out to her, as it should, unless you are dead. You can't

Michele Nardone, CSR, CRR - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold

help it. But being sympathetic is not the same as being credible. And that's what you are going to have to bear in mind.

It was because of this -- I run out of adjectives. I don't even know how to -- because of her life as she led it, she desperately needed to get out of Mexico. She desperately needed to get away. And she met Francisco, she fell in love with him at the tender age of 14, as Ms. Kassner told you; and he broached with her the subject of leaving Mexico and starting a life in the United States, together, as a couple. She was a baby.

What Ms. Kassner didn't mention is that Francisco was a baby too. He was 15, 16. Two babies falling in love, deciding to strike out in America. This is a story that generations have heard and been told, and now she thought it was their turn.

They didn't have any jobs awaiting them when they got here. They didn't have their own apartment. They didn't have income. But she so desperately needed to get away and was so in love, as Francisco was with her, that these two babies came here.

Once they came this wasn't some romantic fantasy.

It's not some sitcom. It was real life. And the reality of no money, no income, no job, immediately became self-apparent, on top of which carrying an \$11,000 debt to smugglers --

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold

coyotes, as they may or may not be referenced during the course of the trial -- that was owed and had to be repaid.

This is no joke. These are bad people.

So what happens? She makes a decision. This little baby coming from an horrific background of abuse, assumed that perhaps the best and only way to survive was to appeal to that base, vile instinct; and she decided to become a prostitute. She was not forced, coerced, tricked into coming here. She came of her own volition, out of love and desire to be here with the man of her choice. I'm not saying it was a good choice, but it was hers.

And the goal and intent was that they would come here, and she would work for whatever period of time it would take to pay off the smugglers, to buy a house together in Mexico and return as a couple. That's what happened. After several years, this is how it continued. They lived together as man and wife.

Her job -- and you will hear the details of it, I'm quite sure -- was reprehensible. But that's what she suffered because, as Ms. Kassner stated, didn't want to be arrested, didn't want to be deported, was still trying somehow to etch out a place that was safe to return to in Mexico with her -- for all intents and purposes, her husband, raise a family and live there.

Slowly that dream died. By April 2014, it was clear

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold

the relationship was over, and she left and she walked into the police -- arms of the police. And, as you have heard, made an arrangement, helped by the government, to qualify and file for this T visa that gave her legal status here and permits her to be here to this day. Now, there is no agreement on paper.

And let me clarify that and make sure you understand. There is no deal on the table that says that if Delia testifies before you in this trial that all her troubles are washed away, no criminal charges will ever be brought to bear against her. This is not on paper.

And let me make something else perfectly clear. At no time did any of my friends behind me at the government table ever suggest, tell, threaten, coerce -- fill in whatever word you want -- to force her to come here and testify.

Didn't happen. They didn't do that. I will not allege that ever.

But if you think in her mind that it's just a coincidence that she hasn't been charged as long as she came forward and was willing to testify against Francisco and the others, and that it's merely coincidental that while she came here illegally, as did Francisco -- she will be on the witness stand; he sits at the table -- while she was here, sending money back, wire transferring money back to Mexico -- as my client Francisco is accused of doing -- she appears on the

Michele Nardone, CSR, CRR - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold

witness stand, he sits at the table. All these things happen.

If you think for a minute that in her mind it's coincidental that he is at the table, she is on the witness stand, and that she got this legal status as a gift, and that there was no -- God, I hate even saying the word -- quid pro quo, well, I tell you what. If you believe it's a coincidence, when you go out tonight, take a good look at the bridge because tomorrow morning I want to sell it to you.

She absolutely links her appearance, her complaint that she first filed in April of 2014, she absolutely links it with her ability to stay her legally and to avoid being a codefendant at the table and instead being a witness against him.

So aren't you happy I'm flipping all these pages here. That's pretty good.

Now, you will also hear -- and I'm going to finish soon, I promise. It's a long day. You will hear that prostitution in Mexico is considered differently than it is considered here. In fact, in the state of Chiapas, which is where Delia is from, the state actually runs a brothel. It's legal.

And I want you to remember that I just said that to you; and, when you listen to the testimony, I want you to remember that and ask yourself a question. After everything you just heard from my friend Ms. Kassner, with prostitution

Michele Nardone, CSA, CRA - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Gold

being legal in Mexico, in Chiapas, her very own hometown, home state, was it really necessary for 16-year-old Francisco to seduce and trick, coerce, force a very unwilling 14-year-old to come to America and work as a prostitute under threat of death to her and her family? Was it really necessary to do that when you have got all of these legally working prostitutes that could easily have been approached without force, without threat, and ask, hey, you want to go to America and work with me as a prostitute? What's so hard?

And then, when you come here, to live with her for three and a half years as husband and wife. Was that really necessary? I want you to think about that. At the end of the case, I'm going to come back to you and I'm going to answer that question to you based on the evidence that will be adduced during the course of the trial; but have that in mind, with everything you hear, every witness that speaks particularly Delia.

Why? Why? Why go through all that trouble? All that hassle? Worrying that this victim -- you are victimizing somebody; that this victim is going to turn on you; that this victim is going to come and fill a complaint against you. Go to an 18-year-old, go to a 17-year-old. Want to come to America? The money is better.

I'm not afraid of your sober, fair, and honest evaluation of the evidence; and, if you find, at the

Michele Nardone, CSR, CRK - Official Court Reporter

41 Opening Statement - Mr. Hueston conclusion of that, that the government has met its burden, 1 2 don't hesitate to convict. I don't believe you will because I 3 don't think the evidence will support that, because, having 4 said all of this, don't think for a minute I'm standing here advocating for prostitution or for sex trafficking, for forced 5 6 sex of any kind. I don't. 7 I stand here advocating for Francisco, and the 8 evidence in this case allows me to do both without a conflict. 9 I am confident that at the end of this case, when all the 10 evidence has been presented to you, that you too will conclude 11 that the government has not met its burden of proof beyond a 12 reasonable doubt; and I will come to you and ask you to return 13 a verdict of not guilty. 14 Thank you. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Hueston. 15 16 MR. HUESTON: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 It's late. But there is some formality I'm going to 18 do, and this is how I have been trained in doing this job for 19 these years. 20 May it please the court, Judge Ross, colleagues, 21 ladies and gentlemen of the jury. My name is Michael Hueston, 22 and I represent Abel Romero-Melendez. You see him at the end 23 of the table.

Now, you have heard a lot of concepts, and I'm the fifth opening statement you have heard and I'm going to try to

24

Opening Statement - Mr. Hueston

be brief. I have been taking notes. You may have noticed, if you have been watching me at all, that I have been scratching things away, because there is less and less for me to say and not waste your time; but a couple of things I must say to you today.

First, again, a defendant has no obligation to offer proof or argument in his defense. This is a key principle of our constitutional superstructure. Not every society has it. They don't value it. Why? Because we believe that the government has that sole burden. And you, as the trier of fact, have that sole responsibility to make that decision. It's valuable, it is sacred, it is completely necessary for a free society.

Now, I do want to make a couple of brief statements about what I think the evidence is going to show. I think you have begun to see it being presented in the different opening statements that you have heard, and I think I can boil it down to one word. It's resistance. Resistance. Now, why do I use that term? Why do I think it's important?

I used to study war theory. It was Carl von Clausewitz, in "On War," and he wrote in that book, in that treatise -- that they study at West Point, that they study around the world -- that the closest thing to warfare is litigation. That's how serious this is. We know lives are at stake. Freedom is at stake. This is deadly serious business,

Michele Nardone, CSA, CRA - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Hueston

and I will carry it out with a deadly serious concentration on behalf of my client.

Now, this is an adversarial process. This, despite the decorum and the sacredness of this courtroom, this is a field of combat; and what you are going to see over the next days, perhaps weeks, is a series of engagements, where lawyers are going to ask questions of witnesses. The government is going to put them up, and we are going to question them.

Obviously, we have an obligation to be fair. We have that.

It's such an important obligation, to be fair; but we have an absolute right to make sure our clients are not in any way denied clear, concise, precise, persistent, dogged questioning to make sure that the people who have been brought here are telling the truth; and, as each one of the lawyers have said, they have a motive. They have reason to lie, to fabricate.

So, yes, this will be about resistance. You are going to see the government is going to use various methods, I would assume. Photos. They may try to put charts or spreadsheets, sort of create this menagerie, this image, that somehow this is all perfectly okay; that there is really no basis to really doubt what they are putting forward.

But I want you to really focus on the questioning that you are going to -- about to see, and, you know, in part of war theory -- I'm not going to talk about what I'm going to

Michele Nardone, CSA, CRA - Official Court Reporter

Opening Statement - Mr. Hueston attempt to do. You know, there is an element of surprise in this. You will see patterns from the defense emerge throughout this case that will undermine their credibility; that will put in doubt the government's arguments and proof. I'm going to ask you to look for those patterns. Now, at the end of these skirmishes, so to speak, these engagements, we are going to come back, and I'm going to then talk about it in summation. And at that point I really will be clear about those patterns, and I will be going over each of the witnesses that I think are important to the government's proof and breaking them apart. I have no doubt about that. (Continued on the next page.)

Opening Statement - Mr. Hueston

MR. HUESTON (CONTINUED): And at that point I really will be clear about those patterns. And I will be going over each of the witnesses that I think they're important to the Government's proof in breaking them apart. I have no doubt about that.

And as all the lawyers have said, until that time, you know, you must keep an open mind. Obviously don't accept anything I'm saying as the truth. It goes beyond common sense to ask for your trust. You know, that's something you earn. And I'm hoping and it's my duty and my obligation over the time of this trial, that I will ask those questions. I would have shown the weaknesses of the Government's case and then you will trust that it is appropriate to bring a verdict of not guilty for my client.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it's been a really long day. You have been wonderful jurors. I know the entire process through jury selection was a very difficult one and a trying one, and here you are at ten minutes of 6:00. I'm sorry to have kept you so late, but it made a certain sense for you to hear all of the opening statements. We'll come back tomorrow. If you'll be in the jury room at 9:30, Dennis will get you and bring you up to the courtroom and we'll commence with witnesses tomorrow morning.

	Proceedings 46
1	Thank you so much. Don't talk about the case.
2	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
3	(Jury exits the courtroom.)
4	(The following matters occurred outside the
5	presence of the jury.)
6	THE COURT: There's something I would like to talk
7	about initially. One of the jurors, I believe it was Juror
8	Number 7, Dennis is going to detain her. Made some comment
9	that she had some appointment tomorrow afternoon that she
10	had to attend. I'm going to find out what that is. I don't
11	know what I mean, it's a little ridiculous. Why don't we
12	do that first, and then we'll go into anything else that we
13	need to do.
14	Emily, will you see if Dennis has that juror.
15	THE COURTROOM CLERK: Yes.
16	THE COURT: I believe it's Juror Number 7.
17	THE COURTROOM CLERK: One moment.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	(Pause in proceedings.)
20	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
21	(Jury enters the courtroom.)
22	(Jury present.)
23	THE COURT: Please be seated everyone.
24	You are Ms. Matos; is that right?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

	Proceedings	47
1	THE COURT: I gather you indicated to Dennis that	
2	you had some kind of an appointment tomorrow?	
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: On the 12th.	
4	THE COURT: On the 12th, which is a week?	
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thursday.	
6	THE COURT: Huh?	
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Next Thursday.	
8	THE COURT: What is the appointment?	
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A doctor's appointment.	
10	THE COURT: I'm sorry?	
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Doctor's appointment.	
12	THE COURT: A doctor's appointment.	
13	Would you rather discuss this at sidebar with	
14	counsel?	
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure.	
16	(Continued on the next page.)	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	Proceedings 48
1	(The following occurred at sidebar.)
2	(Prospective juror approaches.)
3	THE COURT: Let's wait until they all get here.
4	Okay. What kind of doctor appointment?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mammo.
6	THE COURT: Mammogram?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
8	THE COURT: Have you already had one; this is a
9	follow-up?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
11	THE COURT: This trial will probably be over a day
12	or so later. I can understand your concern about the
13	appointment.
14	You can see where we've now launched into what has
15	been a very complex trial to put together?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
17	THE COURT: It's taken months on the part of the
18	Government, Defense Counsel, and my Chambers. It will all
19	be over in two weeks. Will you make an effort
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure.
21	THE COURT: to change the appointment?
22	I think it will probably be okay early the next
23	week, but just to be certain, if you could change it from
24	the middle of next week because, of course, we would like to
25	have you stay on the jury?

	Proceedings 49
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure.
2	THE COURT: You've been selected because everybody
3	wanted you.
4	So I do understand your concern about but, of
5	course, somebody can fit you in an mammogram. Thank you?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
7	(Prospective juror exits.)
8	THE COURT: Dennis will take you out.
9	MR. GOLUB: Judge, while we're here, maybe we can
10	find out once and for all the order of witnesses for
11	tomorrow?
12	THE COURT: Yeah, I was going to ask that.
13	MS. ARGO: We were actually going to put it on the
14	record.
15	THE COURT: Yes, we can sit down and do it in open
16	court.
17	(Continued on the next page.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Proceedings 50
1	(Sidebar ends; in open court.)
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MS. ARGO: Your Honor, the Government plans to
4	call as witnesses Daisy and then Maria.
5	THE COURT: Daisy and Maria?
6	MS. ARGO: Yes, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: All right. And I take it there's no
8	doubt but that will take up the whole day?
9	MS. ARGO: We believe so, Your Honor. We believe
10	that to be accurate.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	Any other questions?
13	MR. GOLUB: That was it.
14	MS. KELLMAN: How about Day 2.
15	THE COURT: Well, actually do you happen do you
16	know who you were thinking of for the next day?
17	MS. HAJJAR: We don't, Your Honor. We think it
18	may be another victim witness, but we would like to just see
19	the first witness and have a determination then. We expect
20	this will go well into the second day.
21	THE COURT: You expect?
22	MS. HAJJAR: That these two witnesses will go into
23	the second day.
24	THE COURT: Will go into the second day.
25	MS. HAJJAR: Yes.

	Proceedings 51
1	THE COURT: All right. And can you tell us what
2	witnesses you are considering as the third witness, just so
3	counsel can be can prepared?
4	MS. HAJJAR: The two witnesses that will likely
5	follow but the order may shift, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: That's okay.
7	MS. HAJJAR: Are Delia and Fabiola.
8	MR. GOLD: Which Fabiola?
9	THE COURT: The Fabiola who was the Jane Doe
10	Fabiola.
11	MS. HAJJAR: Correct.
12	MR. GOLD: Thank you.
13	MS. ARGO: Your Honor, I also had brought with me
14	to court stipulations that each defense counsel has
15	indicated that they do plan on signing.
16	THE COURT: Let's do it right now. Get out your
17	pens.
18	MS. ARGO: With respect to that, I do understand
19	that I think defense counsel would like to address the
20	admissibility of the records, not the authenticity of the
21	records. I believe that would be their characterization of
22	their signing of the stipulations and the Government's happy
23	to address those concerns around the admissibility.
24	THE COURT: Well, we might as well do it tonight
25	instead of waiting to do it.

	Proceedings 52
1	MS. ARGO: Okay.
2	THE COURT: When would you put this in?
3	MS. ARGO: The records, Your Honor?
4	THE COURT: Yes.
5	MS. ARGO: It would be towards the end of this
6	week.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MS. ARGO: It could be as early as late Wednesday,
9	early Thursday.
10	THE COURT: Okay. These are the telephone
11	records?
12	MS. ARGO: Telephone records and wire records,
13	Your Honor, wire remitter records.
14	THE COURT: And precisely what are the defendants
15	objecting to in terms of relevancy of the wire records and
16	telephone records?
17	(No audible response.)
18	THE COURT: Don't all speak at once.
19	MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, I'll volunteer.
20	My real issue deals with two the witnesses that
21	have been identify in the 3500 material.
22	THE COURT: I know and they're now in the 3500
23	material, but they're not going to be called, right?
24	MS. HAJJAR: Likely not, Your Honor, no.
25	MR. HUESTON: So it's Cristina and Lizbeth.

53 Proceedings 1 THE COURT: Right. 2 MR. HUESTON: The argument is this, Your Honor: 3 Given that I see it so that the shifting nature of who are 4 they? At one point earlier in the case when we were doing our pretrial motions, the Government made the statement in 5 its motion in opposition to my motion when I was seeking 6 7 breaking here, Your Honor, that the Government was not 8 claiming or alleging that my client or any of the 9 co-defendants trafficked either of these two women. 10 THE COURT: It's my understanding is that that has 11 been the Government's position, they were not trafficked; is 12 that correct? 13 MS. HAJJAR: Your Honor, I think we made this 14 clear at the status conference before Your Honor a little 15 while ago. The Government's -- Mr. Hueston's client is not 16 17 charged with trafficking those two women. 18 THE COURT: Right. 19 MS. HAJJAR: However, testimony and evidence 20 regarding those two women, the circumstances under which 21 they came to the United States, that they were forced --22 that they were forced into prostitution will come out at 23 this trial. It is part of the sex trafficking conspiracy,

No, I know it's a conspiracy and if it

and it is a conspiracy -- it is a conspiracy.

THE COURT:

24

	Proceedings 54
1	comes in through the rules, it would be relevant. But I
2	guess in terms of your concern, nobody is saying that your
3	client did anything.
4	Is that correct?
5	MS. HAJJAR: That's not correct. That's not
6	correct.
7	THE COURT: Do you mean as part of the conspiracy?
8	MS. HAJJAR: Yes.
9	In other words, witnesses will testify about their
10	observations of those witnesses.
11	THE COURT: Yes, and they can.
12	MS. HAJJAR: And so to the extent Mr. Hueston is
13	arguing that evidence related to these two women I'm not
14	sure
15	THE COURT: I think I made clear that evidence
16	relating to those women insofar as it came in as non-hearsay
17	testimony, as legitimate evidence, insofar as it's relevant
18	and could well be relevant. It could be very relevant to
19	one or more defendants, I have no idea. And in that sense
20	it's relevant to the conspiracy, but nobody will say that
21	your client personally was involved in trafficking of them.
22	Is that correct?
23	MS. HAJJAR: That's not correct, Your Honor. I
24	think that evidence will come out through these in non-
25	hearsay not implicating hearsay at all.

55 Proceedings THE COURT: 1 Okay. 2 But these direct observations will MS. HAJJAR: 3 come out in evidence. 4 THE COURT: Direct observations can come out. I'm sorry, it was awhile since we did those 5 motions but I think I went through a whole list of things 6 7 that I thought could come out very legitimately. 8 MR. HUESTON: You did, Your Honor, and the reason 9 I bring it up because we had this sort of -- I think it's 10 fair to describe sort of this varying position of the 11 Government. I understand what they're saying now. And I 12 understand the rulings that have been made that there are 13 non-hearsay needs to, you know, put in these two women's 14 experience, then they're going to attempt do that. 15 My concern is this: That say, for instance, with the wire records, and the wires will have Cristina Sanchez 16 17 Sanchez and will have \$85,000 that she sent over a period of 18 vears. Now they put that record in of wire transfers. And 19 at the end of the day if there's no one talking about 20 Cristina or Cristina doesn't even come to testify, you know, 21 we're not clear about that, then I'm concerned that the 22 Government's not -- not have the position, we'll not be able 23 to say, well, here we showed you that Cristina was

THE COURT: Well, I think that's something that's

trafficked because of these wire transfers but --

24

Proceedings

going to be part of your summation. The Government's going to argue that whatever evidence they have proves that these people were trafficked and that's why this is relevant. And you're going to argue they don't have enough evidence to even prove these people were trafficked, so this the completely irrelevant.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, not to belabor the point, now the stipping out to phone records, we have the same issue. So it's known that Cristina Sanchez or Lizbeth is using and the Government is going to say, well, this shows that they were involved, they were being trafficked, I get --

THE COURT: No, I mean -- the fact that somebody -- those phone records, there are a lot of different people who may or may not have used individual telephones. And I think -- you know, I don't know whoever's going to testify about it, but I suspect that the Government's isn't even saying that everybody who is listed used the phones.

MR. HUESTON: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: So I don't think -- I don't anticipate that that's going to be a problem.

MR. HUESTON: What I don't want to be in a position, you know, I've created a record here and I don't want to waive an issue and I see that --

THE COURT: You're not waiving any issue you want.

And the other thing is insofar as it's going to be

a relevancy issue before the jury, that is all subject to argument at summation. And it seems to me everybody is up

for grabs at summation.

I don't know what evidence the Government is going to have as to particular individuals and particular phone calls. But, you know, if they haven't proven their case, that somebody used a phone to make a connection, if all they've proved is maybe this person had access to this phone, but we have absolutely no idea who this person called, or this phone may have called that phone, but we don't know who did it and we don't know who got it, that's all you're arguing.

You're not waiving that argument as to ultimate relevance. But I certainly can't say having gone through many of those documents and charts that it is so irrelevant that I would keep it out.

MR. HUESTON: This is the issue, Your Honor, that I'd see there's a difficulty for ne to say, okay, I agree to -- to their admissibility in terms of -- what I hear from the Government is that they believe that they're relevant. Our position is they're not relevant.

THE COURT: Well, yes, but there are two different kinds of relevancy. One I decide.

MR. HUESTON: Yes.

These are --

THE COURT: And the next one the jury decides. I anticipate, unless I hear something different, that they are relevant for purposes of going into evidence, but their ultimate relevance to the jury is something that will no doubt be vehemently argued during summations and you haven't waived anything like that.

MR. HUESTON: I appreciate that, Your Honor, but what I'm saying is if that's the Court's ruling I am going to maintain my objection to introduction of those items.

THE COURT: Well, you know, what we're going to do, then, is you're going to have to show me which ones and why because there are a lot that just don't even fall in that category.

Telephone calls are always like that. I mean, you can only say a particular cell phone contacted another cell phone. You cannot say who did it. Or who talked or what they said. That's just -- that's what that information is.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, this is, I guess, the final point I'll make about this. That the Government is asking us to sign a stipulation, actually they have exhibits that they put together. But I still believe that we're at a disadvantage because they want my signature, you know, and I'm fine in terms of the authentication. I'm not asking for

59 Proceedings 1 custodians coming here, that's not the issue. 2 But --THE COURT: Well, if you want to make individual 3 4 relevancy objections at certain moments, I don't mind, we'll 5 deal with it at sidebar. 6 MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, that is the way to deal 7 with the problem. If I make by objections and we have a 8 ruling, you know, I'll be mindful of that, Your Honor, but I 9 didn't want to address it that just because of these two 10 sort of particular witnesses or individuals Cristina and 11 Lizbeth. 12 Well, if there's special things that THE COURT: 13 you want to be able to address relating to the evidence, we 14 can do it as the trial goes along. I don't see --15 MS. HAJJAR: My impression of Mr. Hueston's 16 argument is that he wishes to preserve on appeal or some 17 other time an argument that Your Honor abused her discretion 18 by allowing this under Rule 403, and therefore does not want 19 the sign a stipulation. If that's what counsel's issue is, 20 I wish we would just resolve it now, sign the petition. 21 THE COURT: Are you making a 403? 22 I don't know what you're doing. That's the 23 problem. I understand your situation with respect to two 24 people who may or may not be witnesses, who may or may not

be people that the Government can prove were forced to do

anything against their will. That's relevancy.

And that -- I can't decide beforehand. I have to hear it.

But when you break that down into individual phone calls, or individual wires it's not going to be very meaningful to me. It's certainly not that meaningful to me right now. It just seems to me that that's in the nature of the evidence. By the same token, all I'm saying is if there are particular things that we can talk about because we're talking so generally now, which has always been my problem with this, if there are particular things that you want to talk about, I'll talk about them again.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, that seems fair. And I --

What's difficult as I see this is the shift, and I'm frankly speaking. These are witnesses the Government says they didn't anticipate bringing them, and they are bringing them and we're sort of just left in limbo.

What I would --

THE COURT: Well, yes and no. I mean, they disclosed everything. They disclosed every little piece of 3500 material about those witnesses. So they've done what they were supposed to do. They've told you about the witnesses before. I mean, they've met their various obligations. Ultimately I have to make certain decisions.

I think I've told you what I anticipate my decisions being. By the same token, I can't fully understand your specific problem with a specific piece of evidence until I can put it in context.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, that's my difficulty, too. Because I think if you -- your suggestion makes sense as their -- as they have exhibits they want to discuss them, then I am able to object if I think it's appropriate to object. I don't really know any other way to deal with it.

THE COURT: Well, I think, I mean, signing the stipulation, at least for purposes of authentication, which nobody has any trouble with. I mean, they don't have to bring in witnesses to put the documents in. If we have legal arguments to make as time goes on, and I understand your concern better and I understand the Government's case better, we can talk about it.

MR. HUESTON: Thank you, Your Honor. That's all I'm saying. I never said that they had to bring a custodian. I don't want to waste time that way at all.

But I don't want to abandon an argument.

THE COURT: You don't have to abandon any arguments. I'm just saying they don't mean anything to me if I don't see really in context for the reasons that I just expressed.

MR. HUESTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

```
Proceedings
                                                                  62
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
1
 2
               I gather nobody else has any problem?
                          Nothing, Your Honor.
 3
               MR. DUNN:
               THE COURT:
 4
                           Huh?
               MR. DUNN: No other problems.
 5
 6
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you. Have a nice night.
 7
               (Matter adjourned to Tuesday, March 3, 2020 at
8
    6:15 p.m.)
                                --00000--
9
10
11
12
13
14
      I (we) certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
    from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
15
                                       2nd Day of March, 2020
               /s/ David R. Roy
16
                 DAVID R. ROY
                                                   Date
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```